



Legislative Bulletin.....July 25, 2007

Contents:

H.R. 2929— To limit the use of funds to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq

Summary of the Bills Under Consideration Today:

Total Number of New Government Programs: 0

Total Cost of Discretionary Authorizations: \$0

Effect on Revenue: \$0

Total Change in Mandatory Spending: \$0

Total New State & Local Government Mandates: 0

Total New Private Sector Mandates: 0

Number of Bills Without Committee Reports: 1

Number of Reported Bills that Don't Cite Specific Clauses of Constitutional Authority: 0

H.R. 2929—To limit the use of funds to establish any military installation or base for the purpose of providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or to exercise United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq (*Lee, D-CA*)

Order of Business: The bill is scheduled to be considered on Wednesday, July 25th, under a motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Summary: H.R. 2929 would prohibit funds made available by any Act of Congress from being obligated or expended for establishing any military installation or base for the purpose of

providing for the permanent stationing of United States Armed Forces in Iraq or for exercising United States economic control of the oil resources of Iraq. The bill also expresses a statement of U.S. policy containing the same principles.

Furthermore, the bill contains 13 findings, including:

- “On May 30, 2007, Tony Snow, the President’s press secretary, said that President Bush envisions a United States military presence in Iraq ‘as we have in South Korea,’ where American troops have been stationed for more than 50 years;
- “On June 1, 2007, Secretary of Defense Robert Gates elaborated on the President’s idea of a ‘long and enduring presence’ in Iraq, of which the ‘Korea model’ is one example;
- “On April 13, 2004, the President said, ‘As a proud and independent people, Iraqis do not support an indefinite occupation and neither does America’;
- “The perception that the United States intends to permanently occupy Iraq aids insurgent groups in recruiting supporters and fuels violent activity;
- “A clear statement that the United States does not seek a long-term or permanent presence in Iraq would send a strong signal to the people of Iraq and the international community that the United States fully supports the efforts of the Iraqi people to exercise full national sovereignty, including control over security and public safety; and
- “The Iraq Study Group Report recommends: ‘The President should state that the United States does not seek permanent military bases in Iraq. If the Iraqi government were to request a temporary base or bases, then the United States government could consider that request as it would in the case of any other government,’ and ‘The President should restate that the United States does not seek to control Iraq’s oil’.”

Additional Background: The House has recently passed various bills expressing identical or nearly identical sentiments to the funds prohibition in H.R. 2929, as follows:

- H.R. 1591, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans’ Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Section 1311). Conference report passed [218-208-2](#). Vetoed by President Bush.
- H.R. 2206, U.S. Troop Readiness, Veterans' Care, Katrina Recovery, and Iraq Accountability Appropriations Act, 2007 (Section 3301). [Passed 221-205](#). Signed into law by President Bush (Public Law 110-28).
- H.R. 1585, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2008 (Section 1222). [Passed 397-27](#). Senate consideration incomplete.

Additionally, as part of the Defense Authorization bill this year, Rep. Steve King offered an amendment to clarify that the continuing prohibition on establishing permanent military bases in Iraq (from [Public Law 109-364](#)) would not prevent the United States and Iraq from entering into military basing rights agreements for the establishment of temporary bases in Iraq. This amendment also stated that, “Congress recognizes that the United States has not established any permanent military installations inside or outside the United States.” The King amendment [failed 201-219](#).

Committee Action: On June 28, 2007, H.R. 2929 was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and to the Committee on Armed Services, neither of which took subsequent public action on the legislation.

Possible Conservative Concerns: Since any Congress, with the President concurring, can undo any public law at any time, and since any Congress at any time could remove funding for any administrative initiative of the Executive Branch, some conservatives may at minimum find the undefined use of “permanent” in this legislation to be perplexing.

Some Members who have experienced military base closings in their respective districts as a result of the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) actions may not regard “permanent” bases as truly permanent.

Additionally, to follow the logic of the findings in this legislation, if the U.S. base in Korea were to close next year, would such base still be considered permanent?

Lastly, since the exact language of H.R. 2929 is already part of a bill signed into law by President Bush (Public Law 110-28), some Members may regard the consideration of H.R. 2929 as political grandstanding, rather than serious legislating.

RSC Bonus Fact: Merriam-Webster’s Online Dictionary defines “permanent” as “continuing or enduring without fundamental or marked change.”

Administration Position: Although a Statement of Administration Policy (SAP) was not available at press time, in the past the Administration has expressed strong concerns at Congress interfering in the conduct of the war in Iraq and its related diplomacy. For information on the Global War on Terrorism, visit this Pentagon webpage: <http://www.defendamerica.mil/>.

Cost to Taxpayers: The bill would authorize no expenditure.

Does the Bill Expand the Size and Scope of the Federal Government?: No.

Does the Bill Contain Any New State-Government, Local-Government, or Private-Sector Mandates?: No.

Does the Bill Comply with House Rules Regarding Earmarks/Limited Tax Benefits/Limited Tariff Benefits?: Though the bill contains no earmarks, and there’s no accompanying committee report, the earmarks rule (House Rule XXI, Clause 9(a)) does not apply, by definition, to legislation considered under suspension of the rules.

Constitutional Authority: A committee report citing constitutional authority is unavailable.

RSC Staff Contact: Paul S. Teller, paul.teller@mail.house.gov, (202) 226-9718